

Applicant : Randy L. Walter
Appln. No. : 10/079,230
Page : 7

REMARKS

By way of this amendment, paragraph [0032] of the specification and claims 17, 19, and 21 have been amended, and new claims 22-24 are presented herein. Claims 1-16 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 17-24 are present in this application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner made final the restriction/election requirement, and withdrew claims 1-16 from further consideration. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider the election requirement and reinstate claims 1-16, since there is no serious burden on the Examiner to examine all of claims 1-24 such as to require restriction. Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application during the pendency of the present application.

Claims 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Stratton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,307). Applicant has amended independent claim 17 to further recite the steps of scaling relative structure coordinates and converting the scaled relative structure coordinates to absolute position coordinates, and respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, are not anticipated by Stratton et al. for the reasons discussed below.

Applicant's claim 17, as amended, recites a method of airport map data interchange in an aircraft comprising the steps of obtaining the coordinates of a reference location, obtaining the coordinates of an airport structure, and communicating the reference location to a display device. The method also includes the steps of computing relative structure coordinates of the airport structure relative to the reference location. The method further includes the steps of scaling the relative structure coordinates, converting the scaled relative structure coordinates to absolute position coordinates, and communicating the structure coordinates to the display device. Accordingly, the method advantageously transmits airport map data to a display system on an aircraft and scales the relative structure coordinates and converts the scaled coordinates to absolute position coordinates for airport map data presentation in a display device. By translating the airport map data into a scale that is compatible with a display

Applicant : Randy L. Walter
Appln. No. : 10/079,230
Page : 8

system, the airport map data is compatible with an enhanced selection of pre-existing display systems.

In contrast, the Stratton et al. reference discloses a ground traffic control system for controlling movement of an aircraft on the ground of an airport. The control system of Stratton et al. delivers a packet of information from a ground controller to an onboard control system as a precursor to aircraft control travel. The package of information includes instructions such as waypoints, travel routes between points, map representations of grounds of a specific airport, and other information. Other than transmitting the packet of information as a precursor to aircraft control travel, Stratton et al. does not describe specific processing or manipulation of the data, such as steps of scaling and converting map data.

In order to anticipate the claim, the reference must teach each and every claim limitation. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that as described in claims 1 and 2 of Stratton et al., the aircraft display shows a map of the airport and the location of airport structures and the ground path of an aircraft based on the location of the aircraft on the ground in real time. However, Stratton et al. does not disclose airport map data interchange as recited in the method of claim 17, as amended. Nowhere does Stratton et al. disclose computing relative structure coordinates of an airport structure relative to a reference location, scaling the relative structure coordinates, and converting the scaled relative structure coordinates to absolute position coordinates as recited in claim 17, as amended. Instead, the data in Stratton et al. is sent as a package of instructions.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 17, as amended, is not anticipated by Stratton et al., and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 17, as amended, and dependent claims 18-21, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

New claim 22 similarly recites a method of airport map data interchange in an aircraft comprising the steps of obtaining the coordinates of a reference location, obtaining the coordinates of an airport structure, and computing relative coordinates of the airport structure relative to the reference location. New claim 21 further includes the steps of scaling the relative coordinates of the airport structure, converting the scaled relative coordinates of the

Applicant : Randy L. Walter
Appln. No. : 10/079,230
Page : 9

airport structure to absolute position coordinates, and displaying the absolute position coordinates on a display device. Thus, claim 22 similarly recites the steps of computing the relative coordinates of an airport structure relative to a reference location, scaling the relative coordinates of the airport structure, and converting the scaled relative coordinates of the airport structure to absolute position coordinates. As discussed above, Stratton et al. fails to teach or suggest a method of airport data interchanged in an aircraft including steps of computing relative coordinates of the airport structure relative to a reference location, scaling the relative coordinates of the airport structure, and converting the scaled relative coordinates of the airport structure to absolute position coordinates. Accordingly, claim 22 should also be allowable in view of Stratton et al. Similarly, dependent claims 23 and 24, which are dependent on claim 21, should likewise be allowable.


By way of the foregoing discussion, Applicant has demonstrated that claims 17-24, as amended, are not anticipated by Stratton et al., and claims 17-24 should therefore be allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested. Applicant again requests that the Examiner withdraw the restriction/election requirement that was made final and reinstate claims 1-16. If the Examiner has any questions regarding patentability of any of the claims, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to discuss the same.

Respectfully submitted,

RANDY L. WALTER

By: Price, Heneveld, Cooper,
DeWitt & Litton, LLP

March 2, 2004
Date


Kevin T. Grzelak

Registration No. 35 169
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
Post Office Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
(616) 949-9610

KTG/jrb